DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 225 576 IR 050 058

AUTHOR Person, Roland C.
TITLE The Undergraduate Library at United States and Canadian Universities: A Bibliographic Review.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 77p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Libraries; Educational History; Higher Education; Library Facilities; Library Planning; Library Services; *Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS *Undergraduate Libraries

ABSTRACT

This bibliographic review of the literature on American and Canadian university undergraduate libraries was adapted from a PhD dissertation completed at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale in 1982. Included are books, dissertations, and journal articles which treat the undergraduate library as a whole, rather than looking at only one aspect of such a library's operations. The essay is divided into four sections dealing with: (1) works which present the origin and development of the undergraduate library as a concept and provide definitions of the term; (2) literature which reflects the philosophy and rationale for establishing undergraduate libraries; (3) publications which describe currently and formerly existing undergraduate libraries at 27 institutions, arranged in chronological order by library founding date; and (4) studies which evaluate and compare undergraduate libraries. The review concludes with a brief summary of trends in the literature. (Author/ESR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED225576

THE UNDERGRADUATE LIBRARY AT UNITED STATES AND CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES: A BIBLIOGRAPHIC REVIEW

by

ROLAND C. PERSON

UNDERGRADUATE LIBRARY

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

CARBONDALE, ILLINOIS

1982

IR050058

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Roland C. Person

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	4
Historical Background	7
Philosophy and Rationale	20
Specific Institutions	33
Comparative and Evaluative Studies	63
Summary	75

Although libraries for undergraduates have existed nearly as long as colleges and universities themselves, the concept of separate facilities for undergraduates on university campuses is primarily a twentieth century phenomenon. In the 1930s, Columbia University and the University of Chicago exemplified distinctly undergraduate collections set up within the university library system.[1] The year 1949, however, is a clear benchmark, for on that date Harvard University established the Lamont Library, the first separate-building undergraduate library on a university campus, and initiated a movement that increased slowly during the 1950s, spread dramatically during the 1960s, and, after reaching a peak in 1973, began to decline in numbers until 1980.[2] That year the tend reversed and by 1982 there were thirty undergraduate libraries.

The reasons for the development of such facilities seem to result from a number of related factors. The tremendous growth of enrollment and concomitant growth in university libraries after World War II seemed to leave the undergraduate student neglected in the emphasis on research and graduate work.[3] These great numbers of new

---

[1]Wyman W. Parker, "Library Service to Undergraduates: A Symposium: The Vital Core," College & Research Libraries 14 (July 1953):272-75; Stanley E. Gwynn, "Library Service to Undergraduates: A Symposium: The College Library at the University of Chicago," College & Research Libraries 14 (July 1953):267-68.

[2]Henry W. Wingate, "The Undergraduate Library: Is It Obsolete?" College & Research Libraries 39 (January 1978):29.

[3]Lois Campbell, "Separate Undergraduate Libraries," Research Paper, State University of New York--Albany, 1972. (Typewritten.), p. 16.

students were often perceived as being unprepared to use the collections of a large research library, restricted by closed stacks, overwhelmed by huge catalogs and numerous branch libraries, and frustrated by lack of study space.[1] Beyond these quite practical concerns, however, the justification for separate undergraduate facilities turned to more philosophical reasons. Undergraduates needed special services and attention to instruction in library skills;[2] they would benefit from a carefully selected collection and a building designed with their needs in mind; they deserved open access and simplified services.[3]

By 1982 there were thirty undergraduate libraries (either in-house or separate buildings) operating in the United States and Canada. These included the original Lamont, and the first large state institution's undergraduate library, the University of Michigan's, opened in 1958. However, during this same period some seventeen undergraduate libraries had ceased to exist.

The first half of the following review of the literature

---

[1]Elizabeth Mills, "The Separate Undergraduate Library," College & Research Libraries 29 (March 1968):144.

[2]Ellen Hull Keever, "Reassessment of the Undergraduate Library: A Personal Critique," Southeastern Librarian 23 (Spring 1973):24.

[3]Irene A. Braden, The Undergraduate Library, ACRL Monograph no. 31 (Chicago: American Library Association, 1970), p. 137.

is arranged thematically, the second is generally chronological. The review covers nationally and regionally published works through the spring of 1982. It emphasizes works dealing with entire libraries rather than articles focusing on only one aspect such as circulation.[1]

The literature about undergraduate libraries is not voluminous, nor is it carefully restricted in focus. Although many books contain some mention of undergraduates and their library-related concerns only two deal specifically and exclusively with undergraduate libraries. Irene Braden's 1967 dissertation on six separately housed undergraduate libraries was published by the American Library Association in 1970[2] and Billy Wilkinson's compilation of various essays and papers on the development of such libraries appeared in 1978.[3] One unpublished dissertation, completed in 1981, dealt with the role of undergraduate librarians as professionals in comparison with other librarians.[4] The bulk of the remaining literature consists of journal articles ranging from descriptions of specific local problems to philosophical inquiries into the rationale of undergraduate library service. Because the

---

[1]This study is taken from Roland Conrad Person, "The Role of the Undergraduate Library in United States and Canadian Universities" (Ph.D. dissertation, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 1982).

[2]Braden, The Undergraduate Library.

[3]Reader in Undergraduate Libraries, ed. Billy R. Wilkinson, Readers in Library and Information Science, no 25 (Englewood, Colo.: Information Handling Services, 1978).

[4]Judith Ann Harwood, "Undergraduate Librarians' Perceptions of Their Functions, Roles, and Characteristics" (Ph.D. dissertation, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 1981).

first separate library for university undergraduates opened in 1949, the literature is predominantly recent in origin and much is predictive, speculative descriptions of what the future might hold in this area of librarianship.

With these characteristics in mind, it seemed most appropriate to divide the literature into various thematic categories, rather than to follow a strict chronological pattern for review. Thus, this review organizes the literature into five broad categories, with a sixth summarizing the whole and showing its effect on the present study. The first part treats the origin and development of the concept of an undergraduate library for university students. The second examines variant problems in defining what might legitimately be termed an undergraduate library. The third part reflects the literature dealing with the philosophy, the rationale for establishing such libraries. The fourth part presents descriptions of specific institutions and their libraries. In the fifth part are reported those studies which evaluate, compare, and contrast, or in other ways judge the effectiveness of undergraduate libraries. Finally, a sixth part summarizes the literature and shows the relationship between it and the present study's intent.

Historical Background

In trying to trace the history of undergraduate libraries one encounters two basic and related problems. One is the absence of, or at least lack of agreement on, a definition. The other, dependent on the first, is the difficulty of pinpointing the begin-

ning or the first example.

Joe Kraus claimed that Olef Rudbeck, Rector of the University of Uppsala in 1601 may have made the first such claim when he proposed a duplicate library of inexpensive editions, "should be set up in the main building for students who may always use them there."[1] A more frequently cited example of the earliest written evidence of a librarian's concern specifically for undergraduates was a letter from Thomas Bodley to his librarian Thomas James in response to James' proposal for a separate facility for the "yonguer sort" at Oxford University in 1607. Bodley declined the suggestion.[2] In this country, Keyes Metcalf found that the 1765 laws for the library at Harvard made provision for a "part of the Library kept distinct from the rest as a smaller Library for the more common use of the College."[3] One or both of these references have been cited subsequently in many of the articles about undergraduate libraries ever since 1947 when Metcalf began describing Harvard's undergraduates and their relations with that institution's library.

However, both of these early examples were so much of

---

[1] Joe W. Kraus, "The Harvard Undergraduate Library of 1773," College & Research Libraries 22 (July 1961):247-52. Kraus was quoting from Ekman's translation in Ernst Ekman, "The Program of a New University President Three Hundred Years Ago, "Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 46 (December 1960):381-82.

[2] Letters of Sir Thomas Bodley to Thomas James, ed. G. W. Wheeler (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1926), p. 183.

[3] Keyes D. Metcalf, "The Undergraduate and the Harvard Library, 1765-1877," Harvard Library Bulletin 1 (Winter 1947):29.

another time and place that they had little application to what actually became undergraduate libraries on university campuses. In the colonial period books were scarce and valuable; libraries were small, as were the colleges themselves; the students were nearly all undergraduates. In this situation, as one historian noted, "The library had no necessary bearing on the studies of the undergraduates."[1] Indeed, with a fixed curriculum of theology and classics, a teaching methodology dependent on textbooks and recitation, library collections built primarily with gifts, and a scarcity of books such that strict regulations for their use were needed, it was not surprising that,

> The American college library from its beginning in the seventeenth century at Harvard to the middle of the nineteenth century seems to have been little more than a storeroom jealously guarded by a senior tutor turned librarian, and, apparently, seldom used.[2]

Not until the middle of the nineteenth century did conditions change much and when they did the impetus came from outside the university. Samuel Rothstein described the transformation of American scholarship which began around 1850. As the natural sciences cracked the rigid barriers of the classical university curriculum, the influences of the German universities increased.

---

[1]Kenneth J. Brough, Scholar's Workshop: Evolving Conceptions of Library Service, Illinois Contributions to Librarianship, no. 5 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1953), p.5.

[2]Lowell Simpson, "The Development and Scope of Undergraduate Library Society Libraries at Columbia, Dartmouth, Princeton, and Yale, 1783-1830," The Journal of Library History 12 (Summer 1977):209.

Lectures and seminars as teaching methods and research as a primary function of the university--these ideas culminated in the founding of Johns Hopkins University in 1876.[1] The emphasis on research meant a great need for libraries to support research and graduate study, and the change from college to university forced tremendous growth on libraries.[2]

These changes did not at first affect the undergraduate greatly. In quoting an 1854 Harvard regulation,

> The books most suitable for the use of undergraduates shall be separated from the rest, and kept in the librarian's room, where they shall be accessible to the students and may be borrowed by them.

W. Carlton noted this simply showed how few were the books needed by undergraduates.[3] Yet as the German influence also led to a system of more elective courses, libraries were slow to respond and students turned to other sources for their information and recreational reading needs. Lowell Simpson showed how the undergraduate literary societies "took matters into their own hands and developed libraries of their own in each college."[4] These student-

---

[1]Samuel Rothstein, The Development of Reference Service Through Academic Traditions, Public Library Practice and Special Librarianship, ACRL Monographs, no. 14 (Chicago: American Library Association, 1955), pp. 7-8.

[2]Idem, "Service to Academia," in A Century of Service; Librarianship in the United States and Canada, ed. Sidney L. Jackson, Eleanor B. Herling, and E.J. Josey (Chicago: American Library Association, 1976), p. 81.

[3]W. N. Chattin Carlton, "College Libraries in the Mid-Nineteenth Century," Library Journal 32 (November 1907):484.

[4]Simpson, p. 211.

owned libraries were particularly strong at Yale, Princeton, Columbia and Dartmouth, and in some cases surpassed the college libraries themselves in holdings.[1]

However, such literary society libraries were not available everywhere nor were all students eligible to join them. At Harvard in 1857, students unsuccessfully petitioned for a separate undergraduate library and reading room while detailing their dissatisfaction with the college library's restrictive regulations.[2] Such a separate reading room was finally established (with student funding) in 1872, but it was short lived.[3] By the 1840s the literary societies were losing their influence and their libraries were of less importance as the college libraries began to expand. At Yale the societies and the College Library merged holdings, although the Linonia and Brothers collection was kept separate and continued to serve undergraduates.[4]

Following the turn of the century, university libraries began to grow rapidly with the emphasis on developing great research collections. Student population doubled between 1900 and World War I[5] and the problems of undergraduates--how to instruct

---

[1]Simpson, pp. 215-16. See also Brough, pp. 14-15.

[2]Kimball C. Elkins, "Foreshadowings of Lamont: Student Proposals in the Nineteenth Century," Harvard Library Bulletin 8 (Winter 1954):41-43.

[3]Ibid., p. 52.

[4]Brough, p. 70.

[5]United States, Bureau of the Census, Historical Statistics of the United States; Colonial Times to 1970, vol. 1 (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975), p.383.

them--grew also.[1] George Strong, using data from a survey of some twenty college and university libraries in 1919, found that although some colleges had for years permitted undergraduates to enter the stacks, "practically all our large university libraries" found it "necessary to conserve their books by a more definitely restricted access."[2] As a result, he suggested that libraries of up to 100,000 volumes should be open to all students; in larger collections,

> there should be built up for the special use of undergraduates a student's library of the best and most useful books in all fields . . . to contain from 15,000 to 50,000 volumes . . .[3] in a building separate from the library building.

A number of universities responded to this situation and made some attempt to provide special collections or services for undergraduates in the years prior to the Second World War. Although they will be described in greater detail in the third part of this chapter, they deserve mention here. At Columbia University a separate reading room, the College Study, was established in 1907 and moved to better quarters in 1934.[4] The College Library at the University of Chicago was established in 1931 with some 2,000

---

[1] James F. Govan, "Collegiate Education: Past and Present," Library Trends 18 (July 1969):16.

[2] George F. Strong, "Student Access to Book Collections--Extent and Methods," Library Journal 44 (July 1919):437.

[3] Ibid., p. 439.

[4] Brough, p. 70. See also Harvie Branscomb, Teaching With Books: A Study of College Libraries (Hamden, Conn.: Shoe String Press, 1964), p. 112.

titles.[1] At Harvard the Farnsworth general reading room in the main library, a circulating general collection in the Union, and the seven House libraries all provided materials and space for undergraduates during the 1930s.[2]

Despite these examples, what John Richards called the "dilemma of the university library"[3] remained as libraries were expected to serve two constituencies--the research program of graduate students and faculty, and the general education needs of a large undergraduate population.[4] One result, which was to have far reaching consequences up to the present day, was the establishment of the first separate library specifically designed for university undergraduate students. Harvard's Lamont Library, opened in 1949, became the commonly accepted starting point for all subsequent discussions about undergraduate libraries, and it was the benchmark against which others were measured for years afterwards.

Definition

Few authors have concerned themselves with defining just what is meant by the term "undergraduate library." Clearly, those institutions having a separate library building devoted exclusively

---

[1] Gwynn, "Library Service to Undergraduates," p. 267.

[2] Robert W. Lovett, "The Undergraduate and the Harvard Library, 1877-1937," Harvard Library Bulletin 1 (Spring 1947):235.

[3] John S. Richards, "The Dilemma of the University Library," School and Society 48 (3 December 1938):725.

[4] Ibid., pp. 725-26.

to undergraduates had little problem with definition, but the case is less simple in other situations. The collections described in the first part of this review were distinguished primarily by their physical attributes. They were collections of books (occasionaly including periodicals and newspapers) on open shelves in a location available for undergraduates to use, either within a part of the university library or totally separate from it and sometimes supported directly by students' funds.

Robert Quinsey, writing in 1949, allowed that while libraries had increased their staffs in reference, established information desks, improved efficiency of procedures, and increased library instruction, what undergraduates really needed was,

> a relatively small collection of books, carefully selected to satisfy the ordinary needs of general reading and instruction, available in open stacks, conveniently located, and informally administered by a friendly and competent staff.[1]

Only the last phrase of this made it different from any of the earlier mentioned collections. In 1952, Raynard Swank observed that the increased emphasis on general education had led to the establishment of separate general education divisions which he charactized as either lower-divisional or undergraduate collections.[2] Both were open-shelf collections of reserve and course-related readings, reference works, periodicals and carefully

---

[1]Robert L. Quinsey, "Undergraduate Library," California Library Bulletin 11 (December 1949):67.

[2]Raynard C. Swank, "The Educational Function of the University Library," Library Trends 1 (July 1952):42-3.

selected general readings, intended to introduce beginning students to a library, instruct them, and, until they specialized, to "spare them the research library (and the research library them)."[1] Again, there was little here that differed from various nineteenth century efforts on behalf of undergraduates.

By 1960, Louis Shores, in identifying numerous separate library facilities for undergraduates, defined them as having between 12,000 to 100,000 specially selected items separately housed, with the intent,

> to provide (1) support for undergraduate courses, including reserve and other classroom assigned readings, and (2) opportunities for enrichment, discovery and entertainment.[2]

Although he predicted that this second characteristic would become so important that "the Undergraduate Library is simply another evidence that reading room and classroom are about to exchange relationships,"[3] his definition did not differ from earlier descriptions.

Ten years later, Robert Muller still emphasized that the distinctive characteristic of an undergraduate library was the highly selective collection of materials.[4] But, he added, besides

---

[1]Swank, p. 43.

[2]Louis Shores, "The Undergraduate and His Library," in The Library in the University; The University of Tennessee Library Lectures, 1949-1966 (Hamden, Conn.: Shoe String Press, 1967), p. 199.

[3]Ibid., p. 203.

[4]Robert H. Muller, "The Undergraduate Library Trend at Large Universities," in Melvin J. Voigt, ed., Advances in Librarianship, vol. 1 (New York: Academic Press, 1970), p. 113.

ample seating, such a facility should have, "ideally, close liaison with the teaching faculty to make it function as an effective teaching instrument."[1] This was a notable departure from the emphasis on collection and physical surroundings which was typical of the descriptions noted up to this time and it was independently confirmed in that same year by Patricia Knapp. She characterized undergraduate libraries as 1) having a carefully selected collection; 2) being designed for physical attractiveness and for encouraging reading; 3) providing efficient high-volume service.[2] Her fourth point, unlike definitions and descriptions of earlier years, emphasized service:

> . . . in its reference service there is stress on instruction in the use of library resources and the library as a whole aims to be an instructional tool through which students may acquire the library skills which they can apply later in larger and more complex libraries.[3]

Jerrold Orne, writing during the same period, acknowledged that the various elements making up undergradute libraries were not new (i.e., study hall, space, the book collection, and what he called propinquity--bringing students and books together).[4] And the guidance he described was more a function of physical design than of librarians' service. Yet he did see as new what he called,

---

[1]Muller, p. 130.

[2]Knapp, The Academic Library Response, p. 6.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Jerrold Orne, "The Undergraduate Library," Library Journal 95 (15 June 1970):2233.

> its mandate to serve as the long footbridge carrying the gauche freshman, often wholly unable to cope with simple library resources, to the level of ready comprehension and use of the massive resources of the larger research library.[1]

None of these factors, as a number of authors had admitted, differed greatly from what any good liberal arts college library had tried to do. The difference, said Robert Muller, was the setting: the undergraduate library was a distinct arrangement within a " . . . typical research-oriented multiversity where undergraduates might otherwise be neglected or discriminated against . . . ."[2]

By the early 1970s enough undergraduate libraries had been in existence a sufficient time for some kind of evaluation to occur. In addition, some of the undergraduate librarians themselves had begun to air their concerns in print. John Haak, in setting out a philosophy for undergraduate libraries, stressed that services which were more appropriate for undergraduates than others were what made such libraries uniquely undergraduate libraries.[3] Moreover, for the first time, a practicing undergraduate librarian set down a definition of just what such a library was:

> 1) a special library for undergraduate students;
> 2) located in a university or other institution supporting graduate work to a significant degree;
> 3) housed in either a separate building or in a self-contained section of a general building;

---

[1] Ibid., p. 2233.

[2] Robert H. Muller, "Undergraduate Libraries in Large Universities: Basic Policy Questions and Problems," in Louisiana State University Library, Library Lectures, no. 11 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Library, 1971), p. 26.

[3] Haak, "Goal Determination,", p. 1573.

> 4) consisting of a collection designed to support and supplement the undergraduate curriculum, and a staff and services which promote the integration of the library into the undergraduate teaching program of the university.[1]

More critical than his colleagues, a former undergraduate librarian, Billy Wilkinson, defined undergraduate libraries as separate buildings designed to provide a full range of services for university undergraduates, particularly those in the Arts and Sciences.[2] However, he did not hold fast to this definition, for he quickly referred to in-house collections as well as separate buildings without distinguishing any major differences.

Ellen Keever, in the first assessment of undergraduate libraries at a specific group of identified institutions, published in 1973, did not specifically define them, although she identified some which had died, some which had been aborted in planning, and still others which were in good health.[3] Two years later, Elisabeth Rebman described undergraduate library collection policies as a group but apparently saw no need for definition either.[4]

In 1975, James Davis, an undergraduate librarian, while not defining the libraries themselves, called for his colleagues

---

[1]Ibid., p. 1578.

[2]Billy R. Wilkinson, "A Screaming Success as Study Halls," Library Journal 96 (1 May 1971):1567.

[3]Keever, pp. 24-30.

[4]Elisabeth H. Rebman, "The Undergraduate Library," Library Trends 23 (January 1975):391-99.

"to develop a general definition of their proper activities, functions, and responsibilities."[1] He pointed out that such libraries should be defined by their service; in fact, he suggested they might evolve into "student or service libraries" from their present position as "the one egalitarian library service on the campus."[2]

The most recent extensive look at undergraduate libraries in total, published in 1978, used no more specific definition than "special collections designed primarily for the use of undergraduate students."[3] However, the statistics used by Wingate in his article to document his charge that undergraduate libraries were becoming obsolete were not challenged in any later literature. In fact, his charge resulted in only two letters to the editor in response.

It would seem that the definition of an undergraduate library, as revealed in the literature, had come full circle. From the earliest mention of such a concept, the idea had been to separate materials for use by undergraduates. More elaborate plans for separate buildings, begun by Harvard and the University of Michigan, stressed facilities as well as collections. In the 1960s service was emphasized and, into the 1970s, it was often deemed of greater importance than the physical attributes of the library.

---

[1] James Davis, "The Changing Role of the Undergraduate Library in Universities," in E.J. Josey, ed., New Dimensions for Academic Library Service (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1975), p. 62.

[2] Ibid., p. 70.

[3] Wingate, "The Undergraduate Library," p. 29.

Yet by the end of the 1970s, one still found articles accepting nearly any collection so designated as being an undergraduate library.

Finally, there has been little concern for specific definition and little acceptance subsequently of the few deliberate definitions which had been presented. It seemed that most writers felt they, and their audience, knew one when they saw one. What was more important was what such libraries did, or were supposed to do, and it is in that direction that this report now turns.

Philosophy and Rationale

Nowhere is it more obvious that much of the literature on undergraduate libraries is repetitious than in the discussions and reports on the rationale for establishing such libraries. Clearly some of this was necessary repetition of factual information, but in other cases it appeared to be mere acceptance of another's ideas without question. Consider, then, the first.

Keyes Metcalf, the indefatigable chronicler of Harvard's archetypical undergraduate library, wrote that three premises underlay the planning for Lamont Library:

> 1. That undergraduates will make more and better use of a library designed expressly for them;
> 2. That this was the best way to relieve the pressure in the Widener building and make unnecessary a new central library building; and
> 3. That if that pressure were relieved, the Widener Library building would become a more satisfactory research center than it has been in the past.[1]

---

[1]Keyes D. Metcalf, "Harvard Faces Its Library Problems," Harvard Library Bulletin 3 (Spring 1949):187.

Furthermore, the main objectives were:

> 1. To concentrate as far as is practicable the library service for undergraduates in a central location
> 2. To make the books readily available to the students
> 3. To encourage general and recreational as well as assigned and collateral reading.[1]

Although Harvard's unusually extreme decentralization of library services made a central undergraduate facility seem the most appropriate response, both the model and the rationale for Lamont were adopted by many institutions. Frederick Wagman, director of libraries at the University of Michigan when the first state university undergraduate library was built, agreed with Metcalf's ranking of his premises and suggested that such libraries might be justified on two levels. The practical concerns involved physical facilities and economic considerations; the theoretical dealt with library service and the students' education.[2] Thus, besides providing a physically attractive place for students to study and read, the intent also was to provide librarians who would assist rather than just supervise.[3]

A British librarian, discussing library service for undergraduates, echoed Wagman's ideas when he listed two basic arguments

---

[1]Metcalf, "The Undergraduate and the Harvard Library, 1937-1947," Harvard Library Bulletin 1 (Autumn 1947):305.

[2]Frederick H. Wagman, "Library Service to Undergraduate College Students: A Symposium: The Case for the Separate Undergraduate Library," College & Research Libraries 17 (March 1956):150.

[3]Idem, "The Undergraduate Library of the University of Michigan," College & Research Libraries 20 (May 1959):184.

in favor of establishing undergraduate libraries. First, the practical considerations arose from problems with shelf space and seating space, particularly in older, poorly designed central libraries. The second related to the service available to undergraduates whose needs were not stressed by librarians in facilities designed for and concerned with specialization.[1]

These two basic arguments may be subdivided. The practical problems of stacks closed to undergraduates; insufficient space for studying and reading; insufficient shelf space for large numbers of duplicate copies; main libraries that were difficult to use; research collections; complex catalogs--some or all of these were used from the very beginning to justify some kind of special provision for undergraduates. Branscomb[2] and Strong[3] pointed out that stack restrictions at Columbia, Yale, and elsewhere led to attempts to provide separate quarters for undergraduates. Henry Shepley noted that one of the aims at Harvard's Lamont was that the student "should find the entire book collection as accessible as possible," with open stacks and specialized reading rooms.[4] An unidentified writer emphasized that this "open-shelf principle--an ideal of

---

[1]M. W. Moss, "Library Service for Undergraduates," in W.L. Saunders, ed., The Provision and Use of Library and Documentation Services, International Series of Monographs in Library and Information Science, vol. 4 (Oxford: Permagon Press, 1966), pp. 96-97.

[2]Branscomb, Teaching with Books, p. 112.

[3]Strong, p. 439.

[4]Henry R. Shepley, "The Lamont Library: I. Design," Harvard Library Bulletin 3 (Winter 1949):5.

Harvard librarians for 75 years," had finally been realized in Lamont.[1]

Sheer numbers of students, especially after World War II, put great pressure on library space, as did the greatly increased size of book collections. Knapp stated,

> There is no question but that the initial impetus toward the establishment of a separate undergraduate library was simply a need to accommodate the exponential growth of university library holdings and the booming undergraduate enrollment.[2]

Warren Kuhn believed the trend toward independent study would impel undergraduates to use the library and increase the competition for space.[3] Elizabeth Mills,[4] Orne,[5] B. Page,[6] Rebman,[7] and Brough[8] noted the pressure toward creating separate collections and buildings for undergraduates.

In addition to the shortage of seating and shelf space in the growing university libraries, a related problem was the dif-

---

[1]"New Library Opened," Library Journal 74 (1 February 1949):166.

[2]Knapp, The Academic Library Response, p. 6.

[3]Warren B. Kuhn, "Undergraduate Libraries in a University," Library Trends 18 (October 1969):189.

[4]Mills, "The Separate Undergraduate Library," p. 144.

[5]Orne, p. 2230.

[6]B. S. Page, "Library Provision for Undergraduates in England," College & Research Libraries 26 (May 1965):122.

[7]Rebman, p. 391.

[8]Brough, Scholar's Workshop, p. 69.

ficulties inherent in dealing with such immense and complex collections. Redmond Burke noted that many institutions believed undergraduates would be overwhelmed by huge collections.[1] Harvie Branscomb suggested that an advantage of an undergraduate library was simplification.[2] Robert Downs commented that undergraduates had been left, "to sink or swim, often lost in the complex organizational structure of the large university library."[3] In speaking of the rise of the number of books per undergraduate at Harvard from 1877 to 1937, Robert Lovett wondered whether, "the complexities inherent in a great collection of books [had] offset the more liberal provision of material."[4]

These various physical or practical problems were common to many universities throughout the periods of growth, but especially in the 1950s and 1960s when student populations and library budgets were greatly increasing. When Braden summarized her data on the six separate undergraduate libraries existing in 1965, she suggested six aims for such libraries:

> [1] Providing open access to the collection to avoid the difficulties of the closed stack system

---

[1]Redmond A. Burke, "The Separately Housed Undergraduate Library Versus the University Library," College & Research Libraries 31 (November 1970):399.

[2]Harvie Branscomb, "The Future of Libraries in Academic Institutions: III," Harvard Library Bulletin 3 (Autumn 1949): 345.

[3]Robert B. Downs, "The Library's Place in Today's University," ALA Bulletin 48 (October 1954):503.

[4]Lovett, "The Undergraduate Library," p. 221.

> [2] Centralizing and simplifying services to the undergraduate
> [3] Providing a collection of carefully selected books, containing the titles all undergraduates should be exposed to for their liberal education, as well as incorporating the reserved book collection
> [4] Attempting to make the library an instructinal tool by planning it as a center for instruction in library use, to prepare undergraduates for using larger collections, and by staffing it with librarians interested in teaching the undergraduate the resources of a library and the means of tapping those resources
> [5] Providing services additional to those given by the research collection
> [6] Constructing a building with the undergraduate habits of use in mind[1]

Of these six, at least four related to the physical or practical concerns mentioned by Wagman and Moss. However, her third and fourth aims dealt with the other side of the rationale, the nature of service and the theory of undergraduate students' needs. This, too, is a recurring theme in the literature on undergraduate libraries.

The idea that undergraduates differed from other members of the university community and had special needs ran side by side with the arguments for space, shelves, and study areas. A critic of such libraries, Henry Wingate, summed up this argument in 1978:

> The basic tenet of the undergraduate library concept is that undergraduate students have abilities, needs, and preferences in areas of library use that are quite different from the abilities, needs, and preferences of graduate students and faculty members.[2]

---

[1] Braden, The Undergraduate Library, p. 2.

[2] Wingate, p. 30.

Knapp noted that since Lamont, proponents had argued that undergraduates were not well served by research libraries and needed separate facilties.[1] M. Stewart assumed a difference between graduate and undergraduate needs and approaches to library use,[2] as did H. Edelman and Tatum.[3] Metcalf believed separation was needed to assure "reasonable good library service" for undergraduates.[4] Ralph Ellsworth agreed that lower level undergraduates needed segregation but upper levels deserved to be treated the same as graduate students.[5] Fritz Veit[6] and Keever[7] simply repeated Braden in assuming that undergraduate needs could be defined and met. John Berry, however, saw the development of undergraduate libraries as a chance for truly innovative service to "that very special undergraduate clientele.[8]

---

[1]Knapp, The Academic Library Response, p. 6.

[2]M.A. Stewart, "The Duality of Demand on University Libraries: Education Trends," College & Research Libraries 8 (October 1947):398.

[3]Hendrik Edelman and G. Marvin Tatum, Jr., "The Development of Collections in American University Libraries," College & Research Libraries 37 (May 1976):235.

[4]Keyes D. Metcalf, "The Duality of Demand on University Libraries: To What Extent Must We Segregate?" College & Research Libraries 8 (October 1947):399.

[5]Ralph E. Ellsworth, "The Duality of Demand on University Libraries: To What Extent Can We Integrate?" College & Research Libraries 8 (October 1947):403.

[6]Fritz Veit, "Library Service to College Students," Library Trends 25 (July 1976):374.

[7]Keever, p. 24.

[8]John Berry, "Undergraduate Specialists," Library Journal 96 (2 May 1971):1551.

K. Brough noted the "particular needs" of undergraduates.[1] Wagman described the "second-class status" as undergraduates which Lamont had changed,[2] and Lois Campbell repeated that notion some thirteen years later.[3] Rothstein summed up the problem of conflict of interest between research needs and those of the university's largest clientele and concluded the resolution was simple: "the recognition that different interests did exist and would have to be served in different ways."[4]

If one believed that undergraduates and their library needs differed from those of graduate students and faculty, then one might readily have argued that it should be possible to identify and select those books best suited to undergraduate needs. Shores, looking at separate undergraduate libraries in 1960, believed their carefully selected collections had stimulated a "revival of lists of books every college graduate should have read."[5] Rebman acknowledged that undergraduate collections largely duplicated system holdings, but emphasized they should be "highly selective."[6]

---

[1]Brough, Scholar's Workshop, p. 69.

[2]Wagman, "The Undergraduate Library," p. 179.

[3]Campbell, "Separate Undergraduate Libraries," p. 2.

[4]Rothstein, "Service to Academic," p. 98.

[5]Shores, p. 198.

[6]Rebman, p. 391.

Wagman, in describing the background of Michigan's undergraduate library, noted that planners had agreed, "that the book collection should represent the best in the human record of the past and in current thought."[1] Muller, describing the same library in less grandiose terms, nevertheless believed one of its chief characteristics to be a "highly selective collection of books and other library materials."[2] These were, if not the best, at least the better or more important books and might even aid the graduate student looking for an overview of a subject.[3]

Wyman Parker extended this idea and suggested the ideal collection would be "roughly comparable to the library of a truly cultivated man."[4] This idea suggested that more than just course supporting materials were needed. Davis included a browsing function in his description of the basic categories of the collection, what he called "materials for students' extracurricular interests and pursuit of happiness."[5] John Lund agreed that the collection should contain "only good books and significant books,"

---

[1]Wagman, "The Undergraduate Library," p. 185.

[2]Muller, "The Undergraduate Library Trend," p. 130.

[3]Idem, "Undergraduate Libraries," p. 27.

[4]Wyman W. Parker, "Library Service to Undergraduates: A Symposium: The Vital Core," College & Research Libraries 14 (July 1953):274.

[5]Davis, "The Changing Role," p. 65.

selected for general educational purposes,[1] or what Quinsey later called general reading.[2]

Along with the idea that books particularly appropriate for undergraduates could be identified went the belief that special services were needed for such students. Donald Coney described the alternatives to Lamont as being a continuation of "small and partial undergraduate services scattered widely over the campus."[3] The same attempt to improve service to students which led to the development of subject-divisional plans of organization also was responsible for many undergraduate libraries, acording to Arthur McAnnally.[4] Wagman went further and related universities' inadequate library facilities for undergraduates to poor teaching and reliance on textbooks.[5] For him, the importance of the undergraduate library at Michigan existed in its

> clear demonstration of the fact that a greater investment in library service to undergraduate students on the very large university campus will elicit a dramatic response from the students in terms of their attitudes toward course work and toward the process of education generally and an equally gratifying response

---

[1]John J. Lund, "The Undergraduate in the University Library," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 28 (October 1941):482.

[2]Quinsey, p. 67.

[3]Donald Coney, "The Future of Libraries in Academic Institutions: I," Harvard Library Bulletin 3 (Autumn 1949):328.

[4]Arthur M. McAnally, "Library Service to Undergraduates: A Symposium: Introductory Remarks," College & Research Libraries 14 (July 1953):266.

[5]Wagman, "The Undergraduate Library," p. 180.

> from the faculty in terms of their teaching with books.[1]

Moss also believed the service in an undergraduate library would aid the student's self education and independent study.[2] Berry sympathized with student protestors in the late 1960s and decried the low status given service to undergraduates in university libraries.[3] Mills concluded that not only did a separate undergraduate library better serve students, but it also aided the university's image by showing that undergraduates were deemed important and were granted special facilities and services of their own.[4] In fact, said Haak, it was its services that made such a library uniquely an undergraduate library and he stressed the relation of these services to the institutional goals of the university.[5]

The shift from the earlier emphasis on space, physical needs, and the collection toward an emphasis on service was especially evident in the increasing stress on instruction in the use of libraries and the role the undergraduate library played in this aspect of university education. Norah Jones emphasized that the most important function of the UCLA undergraduate library was its teaching role in which the librarians helped students both to use

---

[1] Wagman, p. 188.

[2] Moss, p. 101.

[3] John Berry, "The Best Defense," Library Journal 94 (1 April 1969):1401.

[4] Mills, p. 155.

[5] Haak, "Goal Determination," p. 1573.

those resources well but also to go beyond them as needed.[1] M. W. Moss looked at the period when university librarians began to realize they had been emphasizing research over instruction and he saw an increasing concern with instruction as one of the motivations for establishing separate undergraduate library facilities.[2] Muller shared this notion and suggested that a major function was a responsibility for instructing students in the use of the library in order to promote independent study. This, he believed, should be tied to close liaison with faculty to assist the teaching function of the library.[3] John Haak developed this concept further. He divided Braden's six aims into two categories: self-service capabilities and active-service capabilities.[4] The first concerned such things as environment, collections, and programs, which did was require assistance by librarians. The second was the concept of librarians as teachers, working with students and faculty, inside and outside the building.[5] Davis developed this idea and in 1975 suggested that the future of undergraduate libraries might lie

---

[1]Norah E. Jones, "The UCLA Experience: An Undergraduate Library--for Undergraduates!" Wilson Library Bulletin (February 1971):585.

[2]Moss, pp. 91-92.

[3]Muller, "The Undergraduate Library Trend," pp. 118, 130.

[4]Haak, "Goal Determination," p. 1576.

[5]Ibid.

in an evolution "into student or service libraries."[1]

Knapp saw the teaching perspective of the undergraduate library as unrealistic but certainly challenging.[2] Anne Passarelli and M.Abell concluded that a prime element in the full development of undergraduate libraries must be a "committment to the improvement of undergraduate education."[3] By 1978 Allan Dyson observed a considerable expansion in undergraduate library instruction programs over the preceding five years and the attempts to enlist the help of others in dealing with huge numbers of students led him to suggest that,

> Perhaps the role undergraduate librarians will play increasingly in the future will be more that of organizing, guiding, and evaluating bibliographic instruction than teaching.[4]

With this background in mind, and a sense of the rationale used to describe or justify undergradute libraries as a group, one may turn to the literature on specific libraries.

---

[1]Davis, The Changing Role," p. 70.

[2]Patricia B. Knapp, "The Library, the Undergraduate and the Teaching Faculty," in Billy R. Wilkinson, Reader in Undergraduate Libraries, Readers in Library and Information Science, no. 25 (Englewood, Colo.: Information Handling Services, 1978), p. 239.

[3]Anne B. Passarelli and Millicent D. Abell, "Programs of Undergraduate Libraries and Problems in Educating Library Users," in John J. Lubans, Jr., ed., Educating the Library User (New York: Bowker, 1974), p. 130.

[4]Allan J. Dyson, "Library Instruction in University Undergraduate Libraries," in John J. Lubans, Jr., ed., Progress in Educating the Library User (New York: Bowker, 1978), p. 102.

Specific Institutions

Although the Haak definition used in this report eliminates some institutions from detailed examination, still a number have importance for their part in the history of the development of undergraduate libraries. Studies describing them are included here as are others covering a number of libraries even if only some of those libraries meet the previously mentioned criteria (see Chapter I). These accounts are arranged in chronological order according to the founding date of the libraries they describe. Articles which merely mention particular libraries, without detail, are dealt with in the next section of this review. In general, only libraries described in nationally or regionally published reports are here listed.

Columbia University Although Brough mentioned the College Study room, established in 1906-07 and shifted to South Hall in 1934,[1] and Branscomb added a bit more detail about the facilities there,[2] the greatest detail on the Columbia College Library, particularly in the 1950s, was given by Maurice Tauber, C. Cook, and Richard Logsdon in their book on the university libraries at Columbia.[3] They noted as one possible solution to the variety of problems, the creation of an undergraduate library.[4]

---

[1]Brough, Scholar's Workshop, p. 70.

[2]Branscomb, Teaching With Books, p. 112.

[3]Maurice F. Tauber, C. Donald Cook, and Richard H. Logsdon, The Columbia University Libraries (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958), pp. 152-60.

[4]Ibid., p. 160.

Wilkinson quoted extensively from the librarian at the time in summarizing the 1905 rationale for such a library.[1]

University of Chicago Stanley Gwynn described the College Library which began in 1931 as a collection of required and optional readings, some 2,000 titles in all. In 1943 a new college library was established, twice the size of the old, but use declined and in 1949 it was closed.[2] A note in the UGLI Newsletter indicated that an undergraduate library of some 37,000 general interest titles was set up in the old main library in 1973,[3] but no further information appeared in later issues.

Harvard University It is undoubtedly true that more has been written about the Lamont Library at Harvard than about any other undergraduate library. In part, this was because it was the first undergraduate library in a separate building and so served as model to so many after it, but it was also largely due to the numerous writings of Harvard librarians, particularly Metcalf, who chronicled every step in its planning and development.

The February 15, 1946 issue of Library Journal contained a news item on the gift of $1,500,000 from Thomas W. Lamont which would make possible the construction of "the first library for un-

---

[1]Billy R. Wilkinson, Reference Services for Undergraduate Students: Four Case Studies (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1972), pp. 24-26.

[2]Gwynn, pp. 267-68.

[3]UGLI Newsletter 8 (November 1975):2.

dergraduates to be built by an American university."[1] In May of the same year, Rollo Brown, Harvard alumnus, addressed his colleagues through the Alumni Bulletin with a paean to books and reading and a joyous anticipation of the prospects of the coming library in which undergraduates would have "a library of their own in which they will constantly be meeting books face to face."[2] Next year, Philip McNiff cited the influx of students following the war and the resulting space and service problems which emphasized the need for a "special undergraduate library."[3] David McCord pointed out that the Farnsworth Room, a browsing collection opened in Widener in 1916, would move to the new library and, he hoped, continue to "represent the library of a cultivated person."[4]

In three successive issues of the 1947 Harvard Library Bulletin, Metcalf and Lovett traced the history of undergraduate relations with Harvard's libraries, from 1765 to 1947.[5] In great

---

[1]"Harvard's New Library," Library Journal 71 (15 February 1946):288.

[2]Rollo Walter Brown, "A Library As a Place of Discovery: As It Was and As It Will Be for Future Undergraduates," Harvard Alumni Bulletin 48 (11 May 1946):619.

[3]Philip J. McNiff, "Reading Room Problems of the Harvard College Library, 1942-1947," Harvard Library Bulletin 1 (Spring 1947):255.

[4]David McCord, "The Farnsworth Room, 1916-1946," Harvard Library Bulletin 1 (Winter 1947):111.

[5] Metcalf, "The Undergraduate and the Harvard Library, 1765-1877," pp. 29-51; Lovett, "The Undergraduate and the Harvard Library, 1877-1937," pp. 221-37; Keyes D. Metcalf, "The Undergraduate and the Harvard Library, 1937-1947," Harvard Library Bulletin 1 (Autumn 1947):288-305.

detail they reported early regulations, quoted documents and letters and gave a history of nineteenth century library development that has been cited by nearly every writer on this topic coming after them. Through these articles one learned of early attempts to establish facilities for undergraduates; of changing curricular emphases and their effects on library service; and of development of the Union Library, House Libraries, and so many others in the decentralized Harvard system of some forty different locations.[1] By 1939, Metcalf, as librarian, was proposing a building for undergraduates to relieve pressure on Widener and to draw together undergraduate services.[2] A chance meeting with Thomas Lamont at an alumni meeting in 1941 ultimately led to the gift in 1945 which made possible the new building. At the end of the article he listed the objectives of the new library:

> 1. To concentrate as far as is practicable the library service for undergraduates in a central location
> 2. To make the books readily available to the students
> 3. To encourage general and recreational as well as assigned and collateral reading.[3]

Other historical articles appeared in the same publication. Frank Jones documented the development of the seven House Libraries, which began as early as 1930 to provide reference and recreational reading for residents. He predicted they would not be

---

[1] Metcalf, "The Undergraduate and the Harvard Library, 1937-1947," p. 295.

[2] Ibid., pp. 298-300.

[3] Ibid., p. 305.

superceded by Lamont, but would complement it.[1] Robert Lovett performed a similar service for the Harvard Union Library and its forty-seven year history before it was incorporated into Lamont.[2] A 1948 news note briefly described preparations for the move and the planning involved.[3]

On January 3, 1949, Lamont opened at last and Library Journal described its 36,000 titles as making up the third part of the Harvard College Library, with Widener for research, Houghton for rare books, and Lamont as "a reading library for the college undergraduate."[4] Metcalf wrote that the planners had tried to make the collection accessible, the catalog minimal, the supervision non-existent, and the borrowing privileges liberal.[5] He noted that the premises on which Lamont was planned were:

> 1. That undergraduates will make more and better use of a library designed expressly for them;
> 2. That this was the best way to relieve pressure in the Widener building and make unnecessary a new central library building; and
> 3. That if that pressure were relieved, the Widener Library building would become a more satisfactory research center than it has

---

[1]Frank N. Jones, "The Libraries of the Harvard Houses," Harvard Library Bulletin 2 (Autumn 1948):376-77.

[2]Robert W. Lovett, "The Harvard Union Library, 1901-1948," Harvard Library Bulletin 2 (Autumn 1948):230-37.

[3]"Preparations for the Lamont Library," Harvard Library Bulletin 2 (Spring 1948):270-71.

[4]"New Library Opened," p. 168.

[5]Metcalf, "Harvard Faces Its Library Problems," p. 188.

been in the past.[1]

McNiff, librarian at Lamont, described the newly developed charging system,[2] and E. Williams told how the books were selected for the opening collection.[3] Two articles in the Bulletin portrayed more details of the building. Shepley, in writing about its design, noted that the two basic elements were a convenient location and an accessible collection.[4] Metcalf described the building as a library with eight levels divided into four sections.[5] He emphasized that the building was deliberately planned "from the inside out" and, as the first such library, had no traditional patterns to follow: "Those responsible for the plans found themselves pioneering at every turn."[6] Morrison Haviland, noting that some eighty libraries existed at Harvard, pointed out that reference service in Lamont was often a matter of referral to another library.[7]

---

[1]Ibid.," p. 187.

[2]McNiff, "The Charging System of the Lamont Library," Harvard Library Bulletin 3 (Autumn 1949):438-40.

[3]Edwin E. Williams, "The Selection of Books for Lamont," Harvard Library Bulletin 3 (Autumn 1949):386-94.

[4]Shepley, p. 5.

[1]Metcalf, "The Lamont Library, II: Function," Harvard Library Bulletin 3 (Winter 1949):13.

[6]Ibid., p. 29.

[7]Morrison C. Haviland, "The Reference Function of the Lamont Library," College & Research Libraries 11 (October 1950) 298. His nearly identical article appeared in the Harvard Library Bulletin 3 (Spring 1949):297-99.

Richard Pautzsch described the new, simplified classification system devised for Lamont,[1] and Frederick Packard wrote of the audio listening facilities.[2] McNiff and Williams summed up the first year in the new building in 1950, emphasizing the attempts to remove barriers between books and readers and concluding that there were few regrets or problems.[3]

In 1954, Kimball Elkins learned of two Harvard manuscripts from 1857 indicating dissatisfaction with undergraduate library service and proposing solutions.[4] Besides printing the student-authored documents, Elkins detailed the library situation at the time and noted how prophetic the proposals were to Lamont ninety years later. In 1957 Charles Carpenter praised the usefulness of its printed catalog as a book selection tool for college and undergraduate libraries.[5] Kraus turned again to the early records at Harvard for a 1961 article in which he reported that the

---

[1]Richard O. Pautzsch, "The Classification Scheme for the Lamont Library," Harvard Library Bulletin 4 (Winter 1950):126-27.

[2]Frederick C. Packard, Jr., "Harvard's Vocarium Has Attained Full Stature," Library Journal 75 (15 January 1950):69-74.

[3]Philip J. McNiff and Edwin E. Williams, "Lamont Library: The First Year," Harvard Library Bulletin 4 (Spring 1950): 203-12.

[4]Elkins, pp. 41-53.

[5]Charles A. Carpenter, Jr., "The Lamont Catalog as a Guide to Book Selection," College & Research Libraries 18 (July 1957):267.

library regulations of 1765 established a "great Library" and a "smaller Library."[1] The latter was to be separated from the former, "for the more common use of the College;" a printed catalog of this collection was published in 1773 and included some eight hundred titles.[2]

The most recent study of Lamont was that of Braden who told of its development and operation, its design, and use up to 1965. She concluded that Lamont had succeeded as a building fitted to undergraduates' needs, but the segmentation of the collection, the unclassified ordering, and the decreased reference service had not simplified matters as the original plan had intended and use of the library was declining.[3]

In 1967 Lamont was desegregated; that is, opened to Radcliffe students also.[4]

A fine brief summary of the development of Lamont appeared in Wilkinson's 1972 book.[5]

---

[1]Kraus, p. 247. Kraus found the rules first in Louis Shores, Origins of the American College Library, 1638-1800, Contribution to Education, no. 134 (Hamden, Conn.: Shoe String, 1966), pp. 186-87. Shores cited the Harvard University College Book, no. 7.

[2]Ibid., pp. 247, 252.

[3]Braden, The Undergraduate Library, p. 26.

[4]"The Experimental Desegregation of Lamont," Harvard Library Bulletin 15 (April 1967):221.

[5]Wilkinson, Reference Services for Undergraduate Students. See particularly Chapter 2, pp. 21-13, 26-30.

University of Illinois In 1949 an undergraduate division in Galesburg, Illinois, was abolished and the 18,000 volume collection was moved to two rooms in the main library at Urbana and set up on open shelving.[1] E. Heiliger reported that reference service was provided particularly for freshmen and sophomores and in the first year this library accounted for "a third of the increased loan of books for the entire library."[2] William Jackson's account of the first six years of this library's existence noted that from the beginning there were three professional librarians and the acquisition policy sought a "well-rounded collection, rather complete for the needs of underclassmen and reasonably complete for upperclassmen."[3] The staff tried hard to reduce the size of the reserve collection while providing service in "reference, circulation, readers' advisor and instruction in the use of the library."[4]

Because this library had been begun suddenly, with little chance for planning, there had long been a need for more adequate space. By 1960 a faculty conference drafted a resolution (with librarians' help) calling for a separate undergraduate library to aid the needs of undergraduates and relieve crowded conditions in

---

[1]Edward Heiliger, "Undergraduate Libraries," Indian Librarian 12 (September 1957):55.

[2]Ibid., pp. 55-56.

[3]William Vernon Jackson, "The Undergraduate Library, University of Illinois," Illinois Libraries 38 (April 1956):87.

[4]Ibid., p. 89.

other libraries.[1] At an institute on library buildings in 1967, Lucien White spoke of the underground building under construction, and its links to the general library.[2] Karen Rugen described the library, opened in 1969, with its unusual underground design, audio listening center, browsing areas, and generally attractive design, as a change from the "traditional information storage place" and instead, "mind-stimulating as well as enjoyable."[3]

University of New Mexico In 1955, Kuhn described the four-year old Undergraduate Room in the New Mexico Library. Both faculty and staff had seen the need for a facility to house reserves and to provide an attractive place for a selected, open-shelf collection of books of general interest. He listed six advantages, including direct access to books and concentration of undergraduate library services; five disadvantages included duplication of processing, confusion from multiple locations, and a subject alcove arrangement rather than decimal classification.[4]

---

[1]Lucien W. White, "University of Illinois Award Winning Undergraduate Library," Illinois Libraries 50 (December 1968):1042.

[2]"Undergraduate Library: University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois," in Alphonse F. Trezza, ed., Library Buildings: Innovation for Changing Needs (Chicago: American Library Association, 1972), pp. 119-32.

[3]Karen Rugen, "More Than a House of Books: University of Illinois Undergraduate Library," American Libraries 2 (September 1971):880.

[4]Warren B. Kuhn, "New Mexico's Undergraduate Library--Three Years Later," College & Research Libraries 16 (April 1955): 156, 224.

University of Minnesota In an attempt to bring new students "closer to the library materials they will need immediately," and in a convenient open-shelf area, the Freshman-Sophomore library opened in 1952 in a classroom building connected by tunnel to the main library.[1] It had one librarian, some 5,000 volumes, seating for 270 students, and a shelving system arranged by subjects taught in the university.[2]

A note in the 1976 UGLI Newsletter indicated that because the College Library's "operations have been on such a small scale," it would not appear in the annual statistics issue.[3]

University of Michigan After Lamont, Michigan's undergraduate library has been most extensively publicized. Like Lamont, it was first: in this case, the first separate building undergraduate library at a state supported university; and, as at Harvard, it had an enthusiastic chronicler, this time in the person of Frederick Wagman, director of libraries at the University of Michigan. It was Wagman who traced the early reference to a proposal for an undergraduate library at Oxford in 1608, which so many subsequent writers have used as a starting point.[4] He examined the problems involved in serving undergraduate needs on large university cam-

---

[1]Robert H. Rohlf, "The Freshman-Sophomore Library at Minnesota," College & Research Libraries 14 (April 1953):164.

[2]Ibid., pp. 164-65.

[3]UGLI Newsletter 10 (December 1976):2.

[4]Wagman, "Library Service," p. 150.

puses, with particular emphasis on the situation at Michigan in the 1950s with thousands of students, numerous departmental libraries, little space, and projected large enrollment increases. How to make available to undergraduates the books which would "stimulate or induce" reading that required "attention and mental effort" was a concern that by 1951 clearly meant new facilities were needed, and planning for a separate facility began in 1953.[1] Such a building, Wagman felt, would not only solve practical problems, but also would have "an even more profound justification in educational terms."[2] It would encourage faculty in course development, induce students to read, provide an attractive place for study, and make the undergraduate feel he had a place of his own, designed for him while not restricting his access to all parts of the library system.[3]

The building opened in January, 1958 and that same year its first librarian, Roberta Keniston, briefly described its physical quarters, temporarily housing also the Education and the Transportation and Engineering Libraries.[4] A year later Wagman elaborated on his firm ideas about undergraduate educational needs. Tremendous increases in enrollment made traditional librarians' responses inadequate: reading rooms, house libraries, dormitory collections--

---

[1]Ibid.," pp. 153, 154.

[2]Ibid., pp. 154.

[3]Ibid., p. 154, 155.

[4]Roberta Keniston, "Circulation Gains at Michigan," Library Journal 83 (1 December 1958):3357.

these were simply not feasible. Another factor pressing for reform of traditional thinking was changing instructional methods away from lecture-text-reserve reading toward more independent work. The third influence was Sputnik and the cry for more and better education.[1] In 1952, reported Wagman, the university decided not to remodel the general library as had long been planned, but to begin planning separate undergraduate facilities, with open shelves and simplified floor plans. The collection "should represent the best in the human record of the past and in current thought."[2] The response to the library was "overwhelming"--over 60,000 volumes, seats for 2,200 students, a staff of ten professionals--all proved insufficient to the demand.[3] Wagman concluded that the value of the library lay in

> its clear demonstration of the fact that a greater investment in library service to undergraduate students on the very large university campus will elicit a dramatic response from the students in terms of their attitude toward course work and toward the process of education generally and an equally gratifying response from the faculty in terms of their teaching with books.[4]

A 1965 article noted that the undergraduate library's popularity was not the result of collection and environment, for these could work for any library, but it resulted from "the fact that

---

[1]Wagman, "The Undergraduate Library," pp. 182-83.

[2]Ibid., p. 185.

[3]Ibid., p. 186.

[4]Ibid., p. 188.

undergraduates make up the only well-defined yet unspecialized part of the modern academic community."[1] In describing the library's efficiency and its fine collection, the author detailed the planning that went into preparations for the opening day collection of some 40,000 titles and the operating procedures that were to serve as guides for so many later libraries. He concluded, as had Wagman, that success led to further demand: soon after the UGL opened, circulation increased at the General Library and already there was pressure to expand the UGL into all of the bulding it occupied.[2]

Braden's detailed study of Michigan's undergraduate library in 1965/6 observed that the philosophy of reference service there was that librarians were teachers, helping students to learn library usage to go on to more complex problems and situations.[3] She concluded, however, that reference service had not been in much demand nor at a high level.[4] In a 1968 article, James Cook described the problems of overcrowding and the subsequent methods used to increase seating capacity while better ordering the traffic flow and service locations.[5]

---

[1]"The Undergraduate Library," Research News 15 (May 1965):1.

[2]Ibid., p. 12.

[3]Braden, The Undergraduate Library, pp. 54-55.

[4]Ibid., p. 59.

[5]James J. Cook, "Increased Seating in the Undergraduate Library: A Study in Effective Space Utilization," in Barton R. Burkhalter, ed., Case Studies in System Analysis in a University Library (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1968), pp. 142-70.

Robert Muller, then Associate Director of the University of Michigan Library, reviewed the basic problems of undergraduate libraries during a 1968 lecture and noted Michigan's responses to them. Although he agreed that much of what they did was similar to any good college library, he asserted that their difference lay in their setting, in a large "research-oriented multiversity where undergraduates might otherwise be neglected . . . ."[1] He spoke at length about whether to have such a library, what should be in it and what it should do even, in some cases, in spite of faculty. He believed development of undergraduate libraries was

> a way of stimulating students toward using books voluntarily out of personal motivation, independent of specific assignments made by the professors.[2]

The most extensive study of the Michigan undergraduate library was done by Wilkinson who interviewed more than a dozen librarians, as well as students and other users, documented its history, and observed its operation, particularly its reference services. He was critical of the quality of reference service although he noted the library's success as a study hall, social center, and reserve readings area, and he praised the open-stack collection. He believed the ultimate priority of such libraries would have to be increased stress on having librarians skilled in instruction and interested in quality reference service.[3]

---

[1]Muller, "Undergraduate Libraries," p. 26.

[2]Ibid., p. 45.

[3]Wilkinson, Reference Services, pp. 347-49.

University of Cincinnati During a symposium on library service to undergraduates, held in 1952, Parker spoke of the need for undergraduates being brought together with the great books of our culture. He mentioned plans at Cincinnati to establish a separate collection of some 10,000 volumes, along with a browsing collection and rare book room to be open to undergraduates.[1] In 1957 Arthur Hamlin announced the opening of a 3000 volume, open-shelf collection with many classics, intended for undergraduates to develop good reading habits; he predicted it should soon increase to 5,000 volumes.[2]

University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Two separate news accounts of the same discussion session at ALA in 1970 contrasted UCLA's College Library with South Carolina's experience and with more general criticism by Wilkinson. Library Journal reported on Jones' description of an "extremely vigorous program to get students into the library" through music performances, scheduled meetings with professors, ethnic programs, and other means.[3] John Finzi, in a description of the same meeting, concluded from Jones' remarks that

> a major reason for the success of the UCLA College Library has been the active interest of the professional staff, with their outgoing attitude toward the students, and their de-

---

[1]Parker, p. 274.

[2]Arthur T. Hamlin, "Special Library for Undergraduates," Library Journal 82 (1 January 1957):50.

[3]"Undergrad Library Role Questioned in Detroit," Library Journal 95 (August 1970):2594.

termination to establish a special and positive relationship with the students.[1]

Four years after it opened as an undergraduate library in 1966, in the former main library building, the College Library was described in glowing terms by Norah Jones, its head. She emphasized its teaching function, using its carefully selected collection of 137,000 volumes as a laboratory, a place for the "lively minded non-specialist, with librarians who are generalists in the best Renaissance tradition."[2] Frustrated at their inability to generate faculty stimulation of library use, the staff moved to work with students directly and to make students aware of the friendly service in a place designed for them.[3]

Esther Grassian reported in 1976 on a New Book Shelf of uncataloged browsing collections of fiction and non-fiction which "satisfies the far-flung interests of the UCLA community as a whole."[4] With a subject arrangement and frequent weeding, the collection was a "major attraction" in the library.

University of Tennessee In 1959 a 10,000 volume open stack collection for undergraduates was established in the main library,

---

[1]John C. Finzi, "The University Libraries Section," [Report on Symposium entitled "The Undergraduate Library: A Time for Assessment"] Library of Congress Information Bulletin, Appendix 11, 29 (August 6, 1970):A84.

[2]Jones, "An Undergraduate Library," p. 585.

[3]Ibid., pp. 588, 590.

[4]Esther Grassian, "UCLA College Library's New Book Shelf," Unabashed Librarian, no. 19 (Spring 1970):17.

with two librarians assigned to it. Ten years later it occupied a separate five-story building of its own, had a collection of 150,000 volumes, eleven librarians, an automated circulation system, a growing non-print department, and a bibliographic instruction program employing tapes as well as lectures and printed material.[1] Its purpose was described in a flyer as support for "the day-to-day undergraduate instructional program of the university."[2]

Rita Smith and Warner Granade studied the availability rate of library materials and reported in 1978 that users could not find 46 per cent of the titles they wanted at a given time.[3] They noted four reasons for such difficulties and suggested ways to improve the success rate, but none had yet been tested in their report.

University of South Carolina This undergraduate library achieved a peculiar notoriety for being not only one of the earlier and celebrated separate building undergraduate libraries, but also for its subsequent closing. Both events were well publicized. J. Mitchell Reames, its librarian, in 1959 proudly described the planning for the projected opening that year, with consulting from Harvard's Metcalf. The collection was begun with 12,000

---

[1]Jane Gross, "The UGL at UTK: Who Needs It?" UGLI Newsletter, no. 8 (November 1975):14-22.

[2]Ibid., p. 20.

[3]Rita Hoyt Smith and Warner Granade, "User and Library Failures in an Undergraduate Library," College & Research Libraries 39 (November 1978):471.

new books, plus 3,000 reserve volumes, using the Lamont classification system.[1] The following year Reames described more fully the new library. It had three librarians, seats for 600, no periodical backfiles, and a projected maximum collection size of 80,000 volumes.[2]

Braden, using data from 1965/6, noted staffing weaknesses: with only two librarians, professional service was available only two nights a week.[3] As planned, the book collection supported the curriculum, without unrelated general interest materials, and some 50 per cent of the library's use was as a study hall.[4]

Although the closing of the library was not itself the subject of any articles, the impending demise was freely and forcefully advocated by Kenneth Toombs, the university librarian, in a symposium at the American Library Association meeting in 1970. Because of inadequacies in the undergraduate library and unsolvable space problems in the main library, he planned to combine both in a new building in 1973.[5] He criticized the concept of separate services for undergraduates, particularly in light of changing

---

[1]J. Mitchell Reames, "First in the South--Undergraduate Library, University of South Carolina," South Carolina Librarian 3 (March 1959):22-23.

[2]Idem, "Undergraduate Library, University of South Carolina," Southeastern Librarian 10 (Fall 1960):133-35.

[3]Braden, The Undergraduate Library, p. 74.

[4]Ibid., pp. 76, 74.

[5]"Undergrad Library Role Questioned in Detroit," p. 2594.

curricula.[1]

A note in an early 1975 issue of the UGLI Newsletter indicated the merger was expected sometime in 1975.[2]

Princeton University The library here described was never an undergraduate library in the sense of having librarians and full services available. Rather it was an example of a type of house or dormitory library which, unlike those at Harvard, did not ultimately develop into a centralized undergraduate library.

Kuhn described the Julian Street Library in two articles in 1962. The library was designed as a highly selective duplicate collection of 5,000 volumes to be housed in a wing of a part of a new residential quadrangle and opened in 1961.[3] Circulation was restricted to members of the quadrangle and the collection was developed from the list of one of the Harvard house libraries; no librarian was assigned to the collection once it had been established.[4]

University of Wisconsin Like much of the other literature on undergraduate libraries, the only article here was one on the soon-to-open building. Dorothy Schultz, College Librarian, described

---

[1]Finzi, p. A84. Also "Undergrad Library Role Questioned in Detroit."

[2]UGLI Newsletter, no. 6 (February 1975):2.

[3]Warren B. Kuhn, "Julian Street Library," New Jersey Library Association Newsletter (March 1962):9.

[4]Idem, "Princeton's New Julian Street Library," College & Research Libraries 23 (November 1962):506, 507.

the new separate undergraduate library building under construction (also housing the Library School, English, and Philosophy departments) as an expansion and consolidation of three present services: a core collection, a reserve collection, and an audio-visual materials center.[1] Emphasizing the university's response to change, she pointed out that a new building alone would not suffice: "it will take conscious planning by librarians to translate this into activities."[2]

University of Indiana Braden described the development of undergraduate library service at Indiana as beginning around 1950 when the director suggested a new and separate building, but this did not happen and in 1961 the undergraduate library opened in part of a renovated physical education building.[3] It opened with some 19,000 volumes, based on Michigan's undergraduate library shelf list, and by 1963 had four librarians.[4] Its existence came in response to a recognition of inadequate service for undergraduates, closed stacks, a huge catalog, and distant location of the main library, and an increased emphasis on better education for underclassmen.[5]

---

[1]Dorothy Schultz, "The Undergraduate Library is Coming to the University of Wisconsin--Madison," Wisconsin Library Bulletin 67 (January-February 1971):28.

[2]Ibid., p. 29.

[3]Braden, The Undergraduate Library, pp. 78-79.

[4]Ibid., pp. 83, 89.

[5]Ibid., p. 87.

A brief note in 1969 mentioned the new university library with two connected towers, one of which was the new undergraduate library, first proposed some twenty years earlier.[1]

Cornell University In the Alumni News for January, 1962 Billy Wilkinson, the undergraduate librarian, appealed to alumni to donate back copies of periodicals to the new undergraduate library scheduled to open later that year.[2] Library Journal reported on the dedication ceremonies in October which marked the opening of the new research library and the newly renovated old library, now the Uris Undergraduate Library.[3]

The most extensive description of Uris appeared in Wilkinson's case study book, published in 1972. He described the history of the university, its library, and the space problems apparent even as early as 1925.[4] Keyes Metcalf (Harvard) and an engineer were brought in as consultants and in 1955 recommended building a new research library and converting the old to an undergraduate library. This was accomplished by 1962 and the undergraduate library opened with some 42,000 volumes (part from a closed bookstore), and nine librarians (seven from the Cornell

---

[1]Robert A. Miller, "Indiana's Three-In-One," Library Journal 94 (1 December 1969):4399.

[2]Billy R. Wilkinson, "New Out of Old: A Look at Plans for the Undergraduate Library," Cornell Alumni News 64 (January 1962):13.

[3]"Cornell's Central Libraries Dedicated at Two-Day Conference," Library Journal 87 (1 November 1962):3982-83.

[4]Wilkinson, Reference Services, pp. 139-50.

system)[1] in a place designed to emphasize service to the College of Arts and Sciences especially.[2] By 1969 there were 83,000 volumes, and seven librarians. As with his criticism of Michigan, Wilkinson lamented the low calibre of reference service and the lack of attempts to investigate reasons, the limited instruction programs, and the need for "totally service-oriented staff" to help undergraduates.[3]

University of Texas In two similar articles in 1959 and 1960, H. Ransom rather sarcastically described the library situation where underclassmen were barred from all but four rooms of the twenty-seven story library-administration building. Part of the blame he attributed to years of wrong ideas about education, and about books.[4] He described the new Academic Center whose heart would be an open shelf library and would include display areas and audio-visual facilities. He also looked forward to the "mental rather than architectural" changes that would come with such a place.[5]

Jean Cassell described how planning began in 1958, selecting in 1959, and opening in 1963. Using Lamont's and especially Michigan's shelf lists as guides, and a philosophy

---

[1]Wilkinson, Reference Services, pp. 152-54.

[2]Idem, "New Out of Old," p. 12.

[3]Idem, Reference Services, pp. 347-49.

[4]Harry H. Ransom, "Arts and Sciences: The College Library," Texas Quarterly 2 (Winter 1959):vii-viii.

[5]Idem, "The Academic Center: A Plan for an Undergraduate Library," Library Chronicle of the University of Texas 6 (Winter 1960):50.

of attempting "to stimulate lifetime reading interests" as well as curriculum needs, the staff anticipated that use of the undergraduate library would lead to and stimulate use of the main library.[1] Shortly afterwards, W. E. Keys described the building and noted that it was designed "to encourage students to sample many fields of knowledge and to ease the transition from high school to college."[2]

Braden described more fully the planning for the library and its characteristics in 1965/6. It opened with some 60,000 volumes, six librarians, and a small reference collection for what was viewed as a referral library. Atypical of most such libraries, the undergraduate library at Texas handled its own technical services.[3]

Stanford University In 1961 Library Journal called Stanford's proposed new building "the first such undergraduate library west of the Mississippi."[4] Planning began four years earlier with considerable emphasis on "independent study, wider reading, and individual written work."[5]

---

[1]Jean Cassell, "The University of Texas Undergraduate Library Collection," Texas Library Journal 39 (Winter 1963):123.

[2]W. E. Keys, "Library Helps Students Be Scholars," College & Research Libraries 36 (March 1964):62.

[3]Braden, The Undergraduate Library, pp. 124, 131, 127.

[4]"'Top Priority' for Stanford's New Undergraduate Library," Library Journal 86 (1 June 1961):2071.

[5]Ibid.

The building didn't actually open until 1966, but then David Weber described it as "a first-class college library which offers 'a continual invitation to books' as the basic motif of the library."[1] It had four floors with reference alcoves in ten subject locations each containing reference works, periodicals, a catalog of the whole collection, and house phones for contacting librarians; in sum, he felt it was "a building for students who read."[2] Kuhn expressed a similar theme in describing it as a "continual invitation to books" because of its design to surround students with books.[3]

Bowling Green University In June, 1967 Bowling Green's new library opened with an undergraduate library on the first floor. According to Robert Rogers, it was

> designed to identify and meet the needs of all incoming students at the freshman and sophomore level and the needs of the majority of juniors and seniors in the humanities and social sciences.[4]

Its reference desk was staffed by generalists,

> sympathetic to the needs of students who may sometimes find the transition from high school to university a difficult and

---

[1]David C. Weber, "Stanford: Precision Instrument for Undergraduates," Library Journal 92 (1 December 1967):4351.

[2]Ibid., p. 4352.

[3]Warren B. Kuhn, "The J. Henry Meyer Memorial Library, Stanford University," California Librarian 29 (April 1968):93.

[4]Robert A. Rogers, "Wedding Cake in Bowling Green," Library Journal 92 (1 December 1967):4353.

bewildering one.[1]

University of Hawaii When a new library was built at the opposite end of campus in 1968, the old Sinclair Library was renovated and became an undergraduate library with a combined reserve collection. Chieko Tachihata reported that it had some 91,000 volumes, 280 periodicals, five librarians, and a high priority for instructional programs.[2] She emphasized the teaching function of the library, noting that the library was not just a collection, but that "library staff, their services, and programs, together with faculty co-operation, transform the collection into an effective teaching tool."[3]

Duke University A brief note in Library Journal mentioned that portions of the old main library were renovated for an undergraduate library with open shelves and meeting rooms early in 1970.[4]

Northwestern University In trying to improve service to undergraduates and to the whole university, a faculty committee planning a new library in the early 1960s rejected an undergraduate library plan and developed an unusual arrangement called the Core Collection. Karen Horney described this 30,000 volume non-circulating

---

[1]Ibid., p. 4353.

[2]Chieko Tachihata, "A New Kind of Library for the Undergraduate," Hawaii Library Associaton Journal 28 (June 1971): 14-15.

[3]Ibid., p. 16.

[4]Benjamin E. Powell, "Redoubled Gothic for Duke," Library Journal 94 (1 December 1969):4397-98.

duplicate collection within the main library, used by all levels of student and even faculty, as "an always available permanent nucleus of the most essential material in a collection of manageable proportions."[1] The selection began in 1965, using various lists (later including the new Books for College Libraries[2]), and much faculty input, especially since faculty had originated the idea and continued to support it. Besides making sure that one copy of the best works in a given field was available, the Core Collection functioned as an alternative to the reserve room for faculty requests. Horney concluded that this Core Collection was successful in "providing improved service for the undergraduate while retaining the intellectual stimulus of the university research center."[3]

University of California, Berkeley In 1936, Peyton Hurt studied the relationship between the university library and instruction to undergraduates, particularly in light of instructional changes toward more independent study. He concluded that in spite of various tours, handbooks, and even courses, the closed stack system limited undergraduates to the reserve and reference areas.[4]

---

[1]Karen Horney, "Building Northwestern's Core," Library Journal 96 (1 May 1971):1580.

[2]Books for College Libraries (Chicago: American Library Association, 1976).

[3]Horney, p. 1583.

[4]Peyton Hurt, The University Library and Undergraduate Instruction: An Analysis of Their Relationship (Ann Arbor: University Microfilm, 1966), p. 4. This is a reprint of the 1936 edition, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Although he considered a separate undergraduate library as an obvious alternative, he favored a less expensive proposal: the designation of a "librarian for undergraduates" and a designation of an "undergraduate division" of the library to consist of the reserve room, rental service, and an information desk.[1] Material could be temporarily transferred from the main collection as needed. Its success would depend on joint acceptance of responsibility between librarians and faculty in order to improve "the relationship of the University Library to undergraduate instruction."[2]

Hurt's proposals foreshadowed the Moffitt Undergraduate Library of 1970, for which planning began in the 1950s, and the first librarian, Marc Gittelsohn, was appointed in 1968. In a letter printed in a 1969 UGLI Newsletter, Gittelsohn described plans for a structure to house 155,000 volumes and 500 serials, to seat 2,000, and have a professional staff of six.[3]

In 1977 E. Meltzer and W. Whitson described Moffitt's management philosophy of "participatory management and staff development through weekly meetings and task rotations.[4] By teaching a credit course in library instruction, having supervisors share desk duty, servicing five suggestion boxes, offering internships to library school students, the staff was convinced that

---

[1]Hurt, p. 41.

[2]Ibid., p. 42.

[3]UGLI Newsletter 2 (November 1969):1-4.

[4]UGLI Newsletter 11 (May 1977):11-17.

> A staff that feels trusted, challenged, and encouraged to grow cannot help but give service that is more creative, knowledgeable, and enthusiastic.[1]

Southern Illinois University, Carbondale The only published notice of this library appeared in Library Journal when it announced the opening of a 40,000 item collection on the first floor of the central subject-divisional library in 1971.[2] The director had begun developing the collection in 1969 and the library would also house the self-service reserve operation.

University of Washington In 1962 the director of libraries at the University of Washington described plans for a new undergraduate collection of as many as 100,000 duplicate volumes which would help faculty in their courses and students as an introduction to the research collection.[3] This collection was to be housed at first in a reading room of a new addition to the main library to be ready in 1963 and eventually to be in a separate undergraduate library building. Some staff had already been appointed and were selecting materials using the Michigan shelf list and many interested faculty members whose enthusiasm "gives promise that the

---

[1] UGLI Newsletter 11 (May 1977):17.

[2] "So. Ill. University Opens Undergraduate Library," Library Journal 96 (1 December 1971):3938.

[3] Marion A. Milczewski, "Beginning an Undergraduate Library at the University of Washington," PNLA Quarterly 27 (October 1962):18-19.

resulting collection will be a useful teaching instrument."[1]

At a library buildings institute in 1967 the associate director of the undergraduate library discussed the plans for the new building which would also contain a large food service facility and a 1,000 car underground parking garage.[2] The library would have three stories, a centrally open stair corridor, about 180,000 volumes, and aditional seating in the cafeteria for a closed-off study area. Its objectives were to have a selective, accessible collection supportive of the undergraduate curriculum, to provide reference service, to have audiovisual services for instruction and orientation, and "to provide an expanded teaching function to undergraduates in the use of the library.[3]

University of British Columbia Early in 1977 Ellsworth Mason, having consulted for the building plans, described the architectual features of the new underground Sedgewick Undergraduate Library which he praised as being "the most venturesome library built since World War II."[4] He predicted it would be a "seminal influence in the design of new library buildings."[5]

---

[1]Ibid., p. 19.

[2]"Undergraduate Library, University of Washington," in Alphonse F. Trezza, ed. Library Buildings: Innovation for Changing Needs (Chicago: American Library Association, 1972), pp. 104-18.

[3]Ibid., p. 104.

[4]Ellsworth Mason, "Underneath the Oak Tree: The Sedgewick Undergraduate Library at U.B.C.," The Journal of Academic Librarianship 2 (January 1977):194.

[5]Ibid., p. 195.

Northern Illinois University In 1977 N. Vogt described the General Education Library scheduled to open the following year in a remodelled portion of the vacated former main library. It had two purposes: to provide selected materials, especially for freshmen and sophomores, and to give reference service and assistance at a rudimentary level.[1] Instead of formal library instruction programs, the staff planned to concentrate on individual contacts and self teaching audiovisual programs. The collection began with 55,000 volumes, particularly in the social sciences and humanities; it would include reserves, education materials, a music room, and a library science collection, among others. The goal of the GEL was to give undergraduates the feeling that all of this had been prepared "especially for them."[2]

University of Virginia In 1981 Deborah Carver wrote that the new Clemons Library should open in September, not as a traditional undergraduate library, but as a "high-use library for all levels of student."[3] It would have a maximum collection of 120,000 volumes, three professionals, a microfiche catalog, and other features yet to be planned.

Comparative and Evaluative Studies

Here are considered those articles which looked more

---

[1]Norman E. Vogt, "The General Education Library," NIU Libraries 3 (Fall 1977):[2]

[2]Ibid., p. [3]

[3]UGLI Newsletter 19 (May 1981):4-5.

broadly at undergraduate libraries, considering more than one of them at a time, or all of them as a type, and evaluating or making judgments rather than merely describing them. These articles are treated in rough chronological order, as they were written, in order to make it possible to see if there is any pattern or trend in criticism.

> If the terms "undergraduate" and "graduate" must be defined traditionally, I can see no possible basis for establishing two separate library collections which would serve undergraduates as such and graduates as such.[1]

When Ellsworth said this in 1947 he was suggesting that American curricula were blurring the distinction between the two levels and also that the undergraduate college was no longer a clearly unified and identifiable curriculum needing its own library. He was advocating some separation for materials aimed at underclass general education levels, but felt upperclass and graduate students had to be treated as one group and given combined facilities and service.

In 1953, Gwynn, from the University of Chicago, suggested that the problem of the undergraduate library was not simply one of providing a separate collection for undergraduates and general readers, nor was it to devise new ways to get undergraduates to use the library. Rather, he said, the problem was librarians' refusal to acknowledge that "reading or not reading is associated with the basic temperament . . . of a person" and could

---

[1]Ellsworth, "The Duality of Demand," p. 401.

not be changed by librarians or anyone else.[1] Thus, we should make every effort to see that librarians and faculty find all the undergraduate readers and provide them every book and special treatment they need. So much would be gained in a large collection that a "separate selected library" would be a "poor second choice."[2]

While William Dix allowed that special situations demanded special solutions, such as Lamont, in general he felt that

> For the library of less than a half million volumes in the smaller institutions to adopt any system which permits students to use anything less than [the] total collection seems to me a bit foolish.[3]

According to him, one could best educate by turning students loose in a good library under scholars' guidance.[4]

When British and American librarians met in a 1964 conference on service to undergraduates, the British speaker decried standardization (among libraries) and said that if a separate library were to succeed it would have to be physically inviting and have a special staff which could make it seem an extension of, not a substitute for, the main library.[5] The American counterpart

---

[1] Gwynn, "Library Service," p. 268.

[2] Idem, "The Liberal Arts Function of the University Library," The Library Quarterly 24 (October 1954):320.

[3] William S. Dix, "Library Service to Undergraduates: A Symposium: Undergraduate Libraries," College & Research Libraries 14 (July 1953):272.

[4] Idem, "Library Service to Undergraduate College Students: Undergraduates Do Not Necessarily Require a Special Facility," College & Research Libraries 17 (March 1956):149.

[5] Page, p. 222.

simply concluded that there are various ways of providing service and each institution must act in accordance with its own needs.[1]

Another British librarian summarized well the arguments both for and against separate undergraduate facilities. He, too, concluded that each system is different, but he echoed Dix in suggesting that true readers should be found and encouraged.[2]

Mills was the first to publish results of research and interview data to give a detailed idea of which universities had or were planning undergraduate libraries by 1967. Although she used annual reports and other documentary evidence, her reporting was sometimes careless for in her conclusions she paraphrased without citation and there was little original thought in her article. Using Harvard, Michigan, and UCLA as types, she concluded that "the development of the undergraduate library has been nationwide" rather than merely a local response.[3] In fact, she ended by saying

> A definite trend is in motion which will in all probability see the establishment of the two-library pattern on many other large university campuses in the future.[4]

Clearly, the major examination of specific undergraduate libraries came in Braden's 1967 dissertation, in a 1968

---

[1]Stephen A. McCarthy, "Library Provision for Undergraduates: In the United States," College & Research Libraries 26 (May 1965) 224.

[2]Moss, p. 110.

[3]Mills, p. 156.

[4]Ibid.

article reporting on it, and in its publication as a book in 1970.[1] Some or all of these have been cited by nearly every subsequent writer on the topic. The six objectives or characteristics which she felt distinguished separately housed undergraduate libraries from traditional university libraries were based on thorough, on-site studies of the six such libraries existing in 1965-66: Harvard's Lamont; the University of Michigan; the University of South Carolina; Indiana University; Cornell University; and the University of Texas.[2] The objectives were:

> To construct a building with the undergraduates' habits of use in mind
>
> To furnish a collection of carefully selected books containing the titles to which all undergraduates whould be exposed as part of their liberal education, as well as to house the reserve book collection
>
> To provide open access to the collection in order to avoid the problems encountered by the student in using a large research collection
>
> To provide services additional to those given in the research library
>
> To attempt to make the library an instructional tool by planning it as a center for instruction in library use to prepare undergraduates for using larger collections

---

[1] Irene A. Braden, "The Separately Housed Undergraduate Library," College & Research Libraries 29 (July 1968):281-84. This piece is a nearly verbatim rendering of the introduction in the book and the dissertation.

[2] Idem, "The Undergraduate Library on the University Campus" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1967).

> To centralize and simplify services to the undergraduate.[1]

After various comparisons among the six libraries, she concluded that when graduate students make up one-half to one-third of the student body, an undergraduate library may be a likely library alternative; the nature of the main library building--seating, access to books, service, and adaptability--plays a part in determining the feasibility of a separate undergraduate library; and duplication of staff and collections for an undergraduate library is expensive, but the operation is cheap compared to the main library's similar service.[2] Ultimately, she believed, the particular situation at each university determined whether a separate undergraduate library was the best answer to that university's library needs. However, she firmly believed in the value of undergraduate libraries: they had given undergraduates better service and had also lessened the pressures on the main library, thus improving service for graduates and faculty. In summary,

> This method of providing expanded and improved library service has blazed a new path on the frontier of library service--one which many more libraries will eventually follow.[3]

In a query about this prediction, this author learned that Braden had planned to do a ten-year follow-up study, but did not get to it. By 1980 it was her opinion that

---

[1] Braden, The Undergraduate Library, p. 137.

[2] Ibid., p. 148.

[3] Ibid., p. 150.

"undergraduate libraries were a fad that rose and fell and will probably do so again."[1]

In 1968 and 1969 Kuhn surveyed all the universities he could find where undergraduate libraries existed or were planned, including a Canadian and a British university. He found some fifteen of them and described their problems and successes as well as their facilities.[2] He viewed them as part of a trend toward "smaller and more personalized library-learning environments" and as having their own "potential as an educational mechanism."[3] Moreover, in addition to the oft mentioned space and efficiency arguments, he felt that such a library

> represents not so much a lowering of limits as a more effective means of transition from the high school to the college library and ultimately to broader levels of learning.[4]

In 1970 Knapp published an excellent review of the literature dealing with trends in undergraduate education and the response of academic libraries to these trends. Besides undergraduate libraries, she looked at other innovations in universities and community colleges. However, she concluded that the literature revealed "that a great deal more is said about what ought to be done than about what is actually being done."[5]

---

[1]Irene Braden Hoadley to Roland Person, 18 June 1980.

[2]Kuhn, "Undergraduate Libraries in a University," pp. 188-210 passim.

[3]Ibid., p. 207.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Knapp, The Academic Library Response, p. 17.

She also lamented the lack of much that was truly innovative rather than just more of the same programs for more students.[1]

Muller, reporting in the same year, concluded that undergraduate libraries were a "notable new development," but that they had "barely begun to realize their full educational potential."[2] Besides needed educational innovation on the part of the libraries, such as instruction, exhibits, audiovisual usage, noncurricular material, and others, Muller suggested their success would depend 1) on faculty initiative in exploiting the undergraduate library's resources, 2) on credit for students' independent reading, 3) on motivation for students' valuing books and reading, and 4) on encouraging students to resist other attractions that would occupy their free time.[3] Although most libraries were financially undernourished, he believed there was no harm in "dreaming about educational possibilities."[4]

The director of libraries at York University took exception to this kind of thinking by questioning one of its fundamental premises. Thomas O'Connell believed the world had changed so much in the two decades since Lamont that such a solution was no longer applicable. In particular, he did not believe that "undergraduate students today can be seen as a whole and distinguished

---

[1]Ibid., The Academic Library Response, p. 17.

[2]Muller, "The Undergraduate Library Trend," p. 130.

[3]Ibid., pp. 130-31.

[4]Ibid., p. 121.

segment of our academic society."[1] Rather, he supported a high-use, multiple copy collection for all students, and a larger, separate, closed-stack research collection, both trying desperately to keep up with the knowledge explosion.[2]

In another thoughtful essay, Knapp noted that undergraduate libraries had succeeded well in their "self-service capability" but for them to collaborate with teaching faculty in active library service would require a better understanding of university power structures.[3] She suggested that such libraries' objectives were often merely antidotes or reactions to the problems of the main research library, rather than innovations.[4] Knapp presented four general perspectives on the undergraduate library: 1) the radical perspective saw it serving as a "refugee camp" for those displaced from the central library; 2) the statistical perspective saw more of everything--hours, attendance, questions, etc.; 3) the aristocratic provided special services for the cultivated person; and 4) the teaching perspective stressed the teaching function.[5] She believed the teaching perspective was the least realistic but the most challenging and it required understanding the faculties' interests, the students' concern for grades, the amorphousness

---

[1]Thomas F. O'Connell, "Undergraduate Library?" Canadian Library Journal 27 (July-August 1970):279.

[2]Ibid., pp. 281-82.

[3]Knapp, "The Library, the Undergraduate," p. 220.

[4]Ibid., p. 234.

[5]Ibid., pp. 238-39.

of undergraduate curricula, and the power structure of the university. Finally, the service to the mass of students must be made so efficient that time would be left to serve more individually the other functions.[1]

Another critic, a former undergraduate librarian, coined a phrase when he concluded that "All undergraduate libraries have been a screaming success as study halls."[2] In describing six other functions, Wilkinson noted that these libraries were also 1) successful social centers; 2) busy reserve book dispensers; they had 3) heavily used collections; 4) audio facilities but little in films; and 5) reference programs which he categorized as too little and often indifferent.[3] In sum, he believed undergraduate libraries simply were not fulfilling their promise of service, neither with faculty nor with students.[4]

In 1972 Keever surveyed some 75 undergraduate librarians and reported a "vacillation in commitment" on the part of some undergraduate librarians.[5] She attributed this to doubts about being able to define undergraduates' needs as different from other students' needs, yet she noted that where universities had strong graduate programs, both in numbers and in research emphasis, the

---

[1]Ibid., p. 242.

[2]Wilkinson, "A Screaming Success," p. 1569.

[3]Ibid., pp. 1569, 1571.

[4]Ibid., p. 1571.

[5]Keever, p. 27.

undergraduate library concept appeared successful.[1] Where research interest was not strong and undergraduates made up some 80 per cent of the population, the concept seemed inappropriate.[2]

Passarelli and Abell surveyed eighteen undergraduate libraries about their instructional programs and found a range from not even seeing it as a goal to planning a broad systematic approach.[3] Considering the age of the libraries and the literature on active programs, they believed

> it is alarming to find so few in this group actually responding to the challenge, or even considering a response in the immediate future.[4]

When the effectiveness of such libraries is questioned, as it will be, they must be ready with evidence: operational objectives, identification of costs, and means of measuring the effectiveness of their programs.[5] Ultimately it must be a necessary part of the whole undergraduate teaching process, requiring involvement as a main goal, for

> Commitment to the improvement of undergraduate education, individual initiative, and clear operating objectives are the prime and necessary ingredients in the full realization of the potential value of the undergraduate library.[6]

---

[1] Keever, p. 25.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Passarelli and Abell, p. 117.

[4] Ibid., p. 118.

[5] Ibid., p. 129.

[6] Ibid., p. 130.

This is the ingredient referred to by an Australian librarian as the vital part of an undergraduate library's program. Derek Fielding, having observed many examples in the United States, began such a library at the University of Queensland. He based its service on the concept of Readers Advisors who stress liason with faculty, lessening the "us vs. them" divisions. It was basic, he believed, that "Library staff must be free to move out into teaching departments."[1]

In 1977 Keith Cottam, in a somewhat plaintive letter, identified three major issues he believed undergraduate librarians as a whole needed to consider:

> the need for unique collection development statements, the urgency to formulate relevant service philosophies, and the requirement for developing and applying sound evaluative methodologies.[2]

Each of these needs would be vital to librarians who would need to respond to challenges to the existence of undergraduate libraries, and all were more important than concerns with nuts and bolts details. Cottam was not an undergraduate librarian, but a supportive administrator at a university with such a library.

The most sweeping indictment of undergraduate libraries came in 1978 when Wingate documented the numbers which had

---

[1]Derek Fielding, "University of Queensland's Undergraduate Library: Cotton Purse of Sow's Ear," Australian Academic and Research Libraries 5 (June 1974):63.

[2]Keith M. Cottam, [Letter to the Editor] College & Research Libraries News, no. 7 (July/August 1977):196.

closed.[1] He criticized the separation of undergraduates from the university library, the assumption that a collection specifically for undergraduates could be identified, the duplication of books and staff. Considering the number which had closed and the pessimistic comments from some librarians at others, he concluded that "it is difficult to be optimistic about the future of such libraries."[2]

The final source of comparisons (predominantly statistical, not evaluative) was the UGLI Newsletter, published irregularly since 1969. In addition to annual quantitative data about undergraduate libraries, the Newsletter also contained notes on the demise of some, although few details were provided.[3]

Summary

One finishes reading the literature on undergraduate libraries with a sense of a number of threads running throughout, but little evidence of unified theory or agreement as to direction. Many of the early accounts were predictive and almost euphoric, seeing this development from Lamont on as a singular solution not just to library problems, but also to problems of general undergraduate education. And it is clear that many undergraduate libraries were begun not as philosophical and educational innovations, but rather as alternatives to overcrowded, complex

---

[1] Wingate, p. 32.

[2] Ibid.

[3] For example, see the front pages of issues 6, 8, 9, and 12.

central libraries and as attempts to separate undergraduates from the rest of the university population in order to deal with both more effectively.

Another thread is the idea that changes in the educational context of the 1960s and 1970s made such libraries one of a number of alternative responses to criticism of traditional university practices. Advocates of this theory pointed to reaction against large lecture halls and textbook reliance, and saw the new direction as being toward independent study, individualized instruction, and an increased role for libraries, all of which supported the concept of undergraduate libraries.

The library as a place for instruction, and librarians as teachers, was particularly emphasized at the 1970 San Diego conference and periodically afterwards, yet Wilkinson, Passarelli, Knapp, and others also saw the lack of success in this area as a great weakness in the concept of undergraduate library service.

More recent critics have attacked some of the basic assumptions underlying the development. As noted above, Wingate and others questioned whether undergraduates' needs were really different from graduates' needs and whether separating the two was actually in the best interest of either. Such criticism was not new, but the citation of numerous library closings added to the concern to discover why so many undergraduate libraries had closed.

Finally, it is clear that the questions raised by Cottam about collection statements, service philosophies, and evaluation have not been answered and continue to need the attention of li-

brarians, not just undergraduate librarians, but all academic librarians.[1]

---

[1]For a recent discussion of some of these concerns, see Roland Person, ed. "University Undergraduate Libraries: nearly extinct or continuing examples of evolution? A Symposium," The Journal of Academic Librarianship 8 (March 1982):4-13.